



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# FAIR JUSTICE PROJECT

## LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF THE LAW FACULTY AT LVIV IVAN FRANKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

REPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS ON LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY  
ASSURANCE POLICY DEVELOPMENT

**Contract No. AID-121-C-11-00002**

**Authors:** **Prof. Delaine Swenson**, Department Head of the Chair of International and American Law at Faculty of Law, John Paul II Catholic University, Lublin, Poland  
**Finlay Young**, Lawyer and Researcher  
**Dr. Myroslava Antonovych**, Head of International Law Department and Associate Professor of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy  
**Oksana Syroid**, Executive Director, Ukrainian Legal Foundation

July 21, 2014

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

# CONTENTS

I. Introduction	4
II. Executive Summary	5
III. Methodology	7
IV. Background	9
V. Findings and Recommendations for Law Faculty	10
1. Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance	10
2. Approval, Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programs and Awards	12
3. Admission and Assessment of Students	13
4. Quality Assurance of Teaching Staff	16
5. Curriculum, Teaching Methodologies, Learning Resources and Student Support	19
6. Administration and Information Systems	22
7. Public information	24
VI. Recommendations to National Government	25
Annex A: List of Meetings, Interviews and Focus Groups	27
Annex B: Full Survey Results	35
Annex C: Classroom Teaching Observation Protocol	43
Annex D: Assessment Team Biographies	45

## I. INTRODUCTION

The USAID funded Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Program in Ukraine is designed to support legislative, regulatory and institutional reform of judicial institutions to build a foundation for a more accountable and independent Judiciary. To achieve this objective the project coordinates with Ukrainian partners, other U.S. Government supported programs, and international donors to design and implement activities that support Ukrainian governmental and nongovernmental efforts to strengthen the rule of law. Based on an assessment of continued political will to pursue meaningful reforms in the judicial sector, a re-affirmation of the United States Government priorities in the sector and an evaluation of the program performance in the Base Period from October 1, 2011 to September 30, 2013, on September 19, 2013 FAIR was extended for an additional three years. In its Option Period from October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2016, FAIR will build upon the advances made during the previous period and continue providing focused technical assistance to Ukrainian counterparts in the judicial reform process.

FAIR is working to improve the quality of legal education in Ukraine in order to improve the quality of candidates for judicial positions. This includes, but is not limited to, FAIR's assistance in establishing legal education standards, which includes among other things legal profession qualifications framework development, as well as both internal and external quality assurance mechanisms.

Having developed and implemented a variety of programs to promote legal education reform in partnerships with the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Education and a number of law schools together with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Ukrainian Legal Foundation, the time is now ripe for a pilot legal education quality assessment project aimed at enhancing the quality of legal education via developing a modern law school evaluation methodology in line with international and European standards adapted to the Ukrainian context.

Following this goal FAIR designed the Pilot project implementation to provide expertise in external legal education quality assessment in a selected law school. Upon its initiative and agreement, the Law Faculty at Lviv National University was chosen as a pilot site for this assessment.

It was envisaged that this assessment would result in a report with recommendations on how to improve the quality of legal education at the pilot law school specifically and national system of legal education generally.

As this kind of external assessment is new for Ukraine, two foreign experts were been engaged with two Ukrainian professionals supporting and working with them throughout the assessment process to provide context and build sustainability into the pilot program by gaining from the international experts the knowledge, skills and abilities to conduct future assessments of other Ukrainian law schools.

The pilot external legal education quality assessment findings will not only help to enhance the quality of legal education at the pilot law school, but in the long run, help to inculcate a quality assurance policy within the nationwide system of legal education considering the labor market expectations from legal services providers .

The team of experts had the following tasks:

- Develop or propose existing (if any) methodology, criteria and questionnaires for on-site external assessment of legal education quality in a selected Ukrainian law school to be approved by FAIR, taking into account internationally recognized external quality assurance instruments, including the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area and the American Bar Association’s Standards for Approval of Law Schools and Legal Education Reform Legal Education Reform Index Factors.
- Work in the selected pilot law school on evaluation of the legal education process and quality assurance based on agreed upon indicators, which may include licensing, accreditation and evaluation, admission policies and requirements, curriculum and teaching methodology, faculty qualifications and conditions, and institutional holdings and capacities.
- Based on evaluation findings, prepare an assessment report with comments as to whether the proposed and used assessment methodology was adequate to attain objectives of the assessment, has been sufficient to develop recommendations to improve the education process management & enhance the quality of legal education, and proposals to develop quality control mechanisms.
- Submit a final assessment report to FAIR and the pilot law school for review and feedback. Based on a feedback received, if need be, finalize the assessment report.
- Perform other assignments relevant to the tasks under this general SOW.

## **II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report is the outcome of an external quality assurance assessment of Faculty of Law at Lviv National University conducted by a group of international and Ukrainian experts. The project was undertaken by the FAIR Project under funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The purpose of this project was twofold: first, to develop and implement a methodology for external assessment of Ukrainian law faculties and second, to conduct such an assessment to develop concrete recommendations for the improvement of legal education at the Faculty of Law at Lviv National University specifically and other Ukrainian law faculties in general.

The assessment team identified five key stakeholder groups that had to be involved in the assessment: administrators and faculty leadership; teachers; students, graduates and legal employers. The team employed a variety of assessment methods during the assessment process

including computer based surveys; individual interviews; focus group discussions; site and classroom visits; and the review of relevant documents, examinations, student papers and textbooks.

The criteria for quality assessment used as a part of this process were adapted from the European Higher Education Quality Standards. They focused on seven key elements: Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance; Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programs and awards; Admission and Assessment of students; Quality assurance of Teaching Staff; Curriculum, teaching methodologies, learning resources and student Support; Administration and Information Systems; and Public information.

Under each of these seven elements certain desired optimal outcomes are listed that the law faculty is compared to. Under each of these optimal outcomes are listed the key findings regarding that area and the specific recommendations that are the result of these key findings.

This report has divided the recommendations into two groups, those that can be implemented by the law faculty or University on their own and those that will require a change in law or action by the Ministry of Education or other higher authorities.

The assessment team found many positive attributes to the law faculty and were impressed with the commitment to quality. However, some areas were identified as needing further attention as the faculty develops.

The detailed findings and recommendations should be consulted to get a full picture of the report, but some areas raised by the report can be summarized here.

- The law faculty should work to develop its own quality assurance framework on the basis of quality assurance system which would be created by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine following the new Law on Higher Education.
- The law faculty should implement a more effective evaluation system that involves students.
- The law faculty should engage in a strategic planning process that includes a review of current programs.
- The law faculty should better promote the strengths of the law faculty to prospective students in order to attract the best students.
- The method of student assessments should be reviewed and changed to ensure a more relevant mix of testing of skills and knowledge in a fair manner.
- The law faculty should engage legal practitioners more in the teaching and mentoring of students at the University.
- The law faculty curriculum should be revised to allow for the introduction of elective courses to students.
- Basic legal skills courses should be a mandatory part of the bachelor's and master's degree studies. Legal skills development should be an expected and accepted part of the faculty's legal education.
- The law faculty should develop the capacity of the law faculty to teach using modern interactive teaching methods including those appropriate to legal education.

- Legal textbooks and materials should be revised to serve as an effective resource for faculty and students in teaching materials in an interactive method.
- Students should be involved to a greater extent in the operations of the law faculty, including student evaluations and in faculty governance. A less formal environment should be created inside and outside the classroom between students and faculty.
- The law faculty should take full advantage of modern communication methods such as social media, the internet and web sites to increase communications internally and externally.
- The law faculty should create an external relations department to assist it in promoting the law faculty and its students outside the University.

The assessment team would like to further acknowledge that the assessment has occurred against the backdrop of significant political and legal changes in Ukraine that present both a challenge and an opportunity for the law faculty in the near future.

Finally, the assessment team would like to thank Dean Andrii Boiko, the assistant deans, administrators, teachers, students, graduates, legal employers and the staff of FAIR for their assistance in this assessment. We were very impressed with the level of cooperation we received and the level of commitment to the law faculty's further development.

### **III. METHODOLOGY**

This external legal education quality assessment was designed to assess legal education quality at the pilot school, with the overall goal of developing a modern law school evaluation methodology in line with international and European standards adapted to the Ukrainian context. It sought to demonstrate best practices, using a collaborative approach to engage law school leadership and stakeholders in a constructive dialogue focused on quality improvement, and providing a basis for future assessments in Ukraine.

The main outcome of the assessment is this report, which is designed to be clear, concise, and readily accessible to the intended readership, with practical recommendations on how to improve the quality of legal education at the pilot law school specifically and national system of legal education generally. It considers overall legal education quality using seven key elements and institutional criteria based on and adapted from the European Standards for Internal Quality Assurance Within Higher Education Institutions, specifically,

Element 1: Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance

Element 2: Approval, Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programs and Awards

Element 3: Admission and Assessment of Students

Element 4: Quality Assurance of Teaching Staff

Element 5: Curriculum, Teaching Methodologies, Learning Resources and Student Support

Element 6: Administration and Information Systems

Element 7: Public information

The research and subsequently this report are structured around these seven elements and thirteen associated criteria.

The assessment drew on a variety of primary and secondary research sources. Surveys were used to generate data from current students, law school graduates, teachers, and law school administrators concerning perceptions of legal education quality at the Pilot School. In total, 404 surveys were filled out anonymously using an online system to encourage frank and constructive responses. Questions were structured around the agreed criteria and indicators. The five point “Likert Scale” (participants state whether they strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree with the posited statement) was used to allow simple aggregation and comparison of responses.

Key informant interviews were conducted with five stakeholder groups: administrators, teachers, students, graduates, and legal employers. Over twenty individuals were interviewed during the site visit. These interviews were semi-structured, using a mixture of standardized close-ended questions and standardized open-ended questions. Semi-structured interviews allowed for non-standardized follow-up questions so as to further explore key points arising in surveys and questionnaires. Focus group discussions were used to gather more detailed information about particular issues and themes arising from the surveys. These FGDs were designed to consist of 8-10 persons. Ten FGDs were conducted. Classroom observations were used to assess teaching methodologies within the school. A simple assessment protocol was utilized to ensure consistent analysis of classes. Eight different classes were observed by the team.

## IV. BACKGROUND

Ukrainian legal education is marked by particular challenges. Currently, the number of higher education institutions (HEI) graduating lawyers in Ukraine is over 120<sup>1</sup>, while according to an independent survey, among the 120 higher education institutions graduating lawyers, only five were awarded more than 20 points on a 100-point scale based on the perception of the quality of legal education by law school graduates, employers and experts<sup>2</sup>. At the same time government reports that only one in twelve law school graduates finds a job in his/her field of expertise.<sup>3</sup> Since the establishment of the independent rating system in 2009 the law faculty of Ivan Franko Lviv National University was ranked as one of the top five law schools in Ukraine.

There are both public (state) and private law-schools. Some public law-schools are subordinate to the Ministry of Education and science of Ukraine (MoE) while others are founded by universities governed by different ministries (such as the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Agriculture). However, all law schools are operating based on the licenses received from the MoE. The license is a state permission to enroll a certain number of students to the law-school. Licensing for any area of education in the university shall be done separately and in addition to the general license of the university. Licensing procedure is established by government regulations and is overregulated by the quantitative and very formal criteria and requirements.<sup>4</sup> Alongside licensing there is also an accreditation process for law-schools. Formally, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Information from educational web-portal <http://osvita.ua/vnz/guide/search-17-0-0-61-0.html>.

<sup>2</sup> See in particular: [http://bestuniversities.com.ua/sites/default/files/Rating2013\\_vse%20napravlenija.pdf](http://bestuniversities.com.ua/sites/default/files/Rating2013_vse%20napravlenija.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g.: <http://www.dt.ua/3000/3300/64675/>.

<sup>4</sup> See in particular: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1380-2003-%D0%BF>,  
<http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1019-2007-%D0%BF>.



accreditation process is a confirmation of the ability of the law-school to provide quality education. However, in practice the accreditation process is a duplication of the licensing process as it is based on the same quantitative criteria.<sup>5</sup>

On July 1, 2014 the Parliament of Ukraine voted for the new Law On High Education.<sup>6</sup> Unfortunately, new Law does not provide for significant improvement in the area of quality assurance. The Law establishes of the National Agency for Quality Assurance (the Agency). At the same time, the quality assurance is neither major nor self-sufficient function of the Agency. The Law retains the same nontransparent system of separate licensing of all area of education upon the expert opinion from the Agency<sup>7</sup>. The Agency is also authorized to do the accreditation, the procedure of which is not identified by the Law.<sup>8</sup> In addition, the Agency is doing external quality assurance and supervising internal quality assurance, both of which are not connected neither to the licensing nor accreditation process.<sup>9</sup>

Considering, that neither goal nor procedures of the quality assurance are clearly specified in new Law, it is difficult to expect the establishment of transparent and efficient quality assurance system for high education. Moreover, the fact that the Agency itself is a subject of Government supervision, its Statute has to be approved by the Government, and the head of the Agency is a subject to appointment by the Government, significantly undermines the credibility of the Agency as independent body for quality assurance.

There are three sources of legal education funding: state allocation by MoE whereby students are enrolled to be funded by state, state allocation by other ministries and bodies of local self-government, and private funding by the student. There are no clear and transparent criteria or procedures established for state allocation for any area of education, including legal education. MoE has full discretion to change the state allocation in any year for any law-school. As a result, in most law-schools state allocation coexists with private funding legal education.

Lawyers in Ukraine were trained for the bachelor's, specialist's, and master's degrees, which reflects the mix of Soviet and Bologna approaches to the higher education. New Law "On High Education" abolishes the specialist degree. At the same time considering that almost 100% of Bachelors students proceeded with their education on specialist or master level there is ambiguous separation between these degrees or positions in the practical work of a lawyer having a corresponding degree.

There is no standard (qualification framework) for legal education in Ukraine. The content of legal education is governed by the draft standard for legal education developed in 2004<sup>10</sup> and is stipulated in a curriculum - a higher education institution's regulatory document. Further, there is

---

<sup>5</sup> See in particular: <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1019-2007-%D0%BF>.

<sup>6</sup> When the Report was prepared the new Law has not entered into force yet as it was not signed by the President of Ukraine.

<sup>7</sup> The Law of Ukraine On High Education, adopted on July 1, 2014, Art. 24.

<sup>8</sup> The Law of Ukraine On High Education, adopted on July 1, 2014, Art. 25.

<sup>9</sup> The Law of Ukraine On High Education, adopted on July 1, 2014, Art. 18.

<sup>10</sup> See the report "State of Legal Education and Science in Ukraine" [http://upf.com.ua/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/legal-education-report\\_final\\_ENG-tr.pdf](http://upf.com.ua/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/legal-education-report_final_ENG-tr.pdf), p. 29-34

no clearly established assessment system in Ukraine - a five-grade scale and the European 100-grade scale (ECTS) – are generally mixed.

Overall, the content and the methodology of teaching in the law schools derives from the Ukraine's understanding of the legal profession, which is still predominantly based on Soviet approach which focuses less on philosophy and principles of the law, human rights protection etc., than on "social anomalies", the need "to exercise powers of government in the name of the law", and resolve "specific cases" and "legal issues".<sup>11</sup>

## V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LAW FACULTY

### **Element 1: Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance**

#### Element 1: Notable Survey Findings

- 93% of students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “the law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education”, with similar levels of agreement on the existence of policies to ensure this is the case. However, students responded less positively to the statement that “there are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education”, with only 63% agreeing or strongly agreeing.
- Unsurprisingly, all teachers (100%) agreed or strongly agreed that “the law school recognizes, values and encourages quality legal education”, and 90% agreed or strongly agreed that the law school “has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education”. Administrator answers were broadly similar to those of the teachers.

**1.1:** Institution has clear policies and associated procedures for the assurance of the quality and standards of programs and awards.

#### **Key Findings:**

- While law faculty leadership is clearly committed to improving legal education quality, there is currently no formal quality assurance framework in place, nor any significant institutional knowledge of modern quality assurance methodologies. This does not mean that the Law Faculty is not able to provide teaching of a good standard. Rather, it means that there are no procedures in place that ensure this is verifiably and consistently the case, in all courses, and from all teachers.

---

<sup>11</sup> For more details see the report “State of Legal Education and Science in Ukraine” [http://upf.com.ua/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/legal-education-report\\_final\\_ENG-tr.pdf](http://upf.com.ua/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/legal-education-report_final_ENG-tr.pdf), p. 43-49.

- New Law On High Education requires that high educational institutions shall apply internal quality assurance, meaning in particular: establishment of principles and procedures, monitoring and review of training programs, evaluation of students and faculty members, training for faculty members, publicity, combatting plagiarism.<sup>12</sup>

#### **Recommendations:**

- The law faculty must develop its own overall written quality assurance framework, focused on making systematic and methodical quality assurance an integrated part of faculty life. This quality assurance framework should include clear policies and procedures that ensure the continuous assessment of the programs and awards on offer, teaching, and examinations. It should specify the active participation of administration, teachers and students in this process.

**1.2:** Institution has a culture that recognizes the importance of quality, and quality assurance, in education.

#### **Key findings:**

- The Law Faculty recognizes the important of quality in its teaching, and the culture of the school is receptive to new quality assurance methodologies. However, what is considered as quality education is not consistent or clearly defined across faculty and staff. For many, quality education is considered to be simply the imparting of legal knowledge to students. This, while important, is not sufficient to prepare students for legal careers. The culture of the school is to a large extent focused on this knowledge-based definition of quality.

#### **Recommendations:**

- The law faculty, as part of a strategic planning process, and in consultation with best practices from other contexts, must refine and accept a definition for the quality education it seeks to provide. This should include not only knowledge and understanding, but also emphasize the importance of applied knowledge, core skills, problem solving and soft skills such as teamwork.

**1.3** Institution has a formal and publicly available strategy, policy and procedures for the continuous enhancement of quality, including role for students and other stakeholders.

#### **Key findings:**

- In 2010 Ivan Franko Lviv National University has developed and published its Strategy of Development.<sup>13</sup> Even though the quality of University education is mentioned as one

---

<sup>12</sup> The Law of Ukraine "On High Education" adopted on July 1, 2014, Art. 16.

<sup>13</sup> See: <http://lnu.edu.ua/index.php?q=university/program>

of the priorities for development the document itself is more like a list of action than a strategic view of the development.

- There is currently no formal and publicly available strategy for enhancing quality within the law school. The development of a process to produce such a strategy is one of the first steps the faculty must make.

### **Recommendations:**

- The law faculty should put together a committee of stake holders (administration, faculty, students, and graduates) that would work out a 1, 3 and 5-year strategic plan for the faculty. The first step for the development of the strategic plan should be a discussion within the law faculty about the desired quality assurance goals and outcomes. A common vision for the law faculty should be developed as part of this process.

## **Element 2: Approval, Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programs and Awards**

### Element 2: Notable Survey Findings

- 72% of students agreed or strongly agreed that “the law school monitors the quality of legal education provided to students”. This was broadly similar to teacher responses, with 79% of teachers either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement.
- Interestingly, graduates of the past five years responded far more critically to the same statement, with 62% neutral or disagreeing with the statement. This may reflect the law school’s attempts to improve monitoring in more recent years.

**2.1** Institution has formal mechanisms for the approval, periodic review and monitoring of programs and awards.

### **Key Findings:**

- The law faculty has a clear system in place for the review and approval of programs and awards. However, there are no set criteria for this review, and its purpose is not clear. While changes can and have been made as a result of this review, the lack of review criteria means that changes are generally not consistent or in line with an identifiable strategy.
- Monitoring of programs and awards takes place via department heads and their participation on the Scholarly meeting of faculty. This process is limited in scope, and very subjective dependent upon the perspectives of the department head.

### **Recommendations:**

- As part of its strategic planning process, and in line with the objectives identified for the school, the law faculty should identify criteria and mechanisms for the systematic and thorough review of programs and awards to ensure they are in line with international standards and the evolving demands of the job market.

### **Element 3: Admission and Assessment of students**

#### **Element 3: Notable Survey Findings**

- There was a clear discrepancy between teacher and student perceptions of marking and feedback norms within the law school. In particular, only 52% of students agreed or strongly agreed that “feedback was received promptly”, compared with 90% of teachers.
- In addition, a significant percentage of students (45%) strongly disagreed, disagreed, or were neutral, when asked whether this “feedback helped to clarify things they did not understand”. 90% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that their feedback was designed to achieve this goal.
- Students and teachers were generally in agreement “the Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic” with 73% and 89% agreeing or strongly agreeing respectively. Again, past graduates perceived admissions far more critically, with only 41% agreeing or strongly agreeing with the same statement.

### **3.1 Institution students are admitted via a transparent, fair, and meritocratic process.**

#### **Key Findings:**

- While admission to the law faculty can be said to be generally transparent and fair, it is not entirely meritocratic. The current system where government funded students are selected based on performance in the national centrally administered test, while privately funded students enter based only on their ability to pay, is not optimal. Overall, a situation is created where there is, according to most teachers, a disparity between the quality of government funded students (who are selected on merit) and privately funded students (who are not).
- If law school admission is to be considered meritocratic, it must be based upon some element of competition between applicants. This competition ensures that only students with the requisite skill and knowledge base are admitted, and among them, the most qualified are selected. Currently, while prospective students compete for government funding, entry to the Law faculty itself is not competitive. If students do not get government funding via the examination, they can be admitted, like the vast majority of students are, as privately funded students. According to interviews, the final number of

applicants is normally lower than the number of available spaces. This is obviously detrimental to the quality of the student body. As one senior faculty member noted in an interview, “it shouldn’t be that if you have money you can go to the best schools.”

- The reason this situation exists is a product of a number of inter-related factors, most of which are outside the law faculty’s control. There is no inherent problem with a centrally administered examination as exists in Ukraine. Indeed, it can be one very useful tool for law schools to compare the aptitude of applying students. However, the Ministry of Education decides the overall number of government-funded places at the Law Faculty. That such a low number is allocated as compared to other law schools, via a process that is not open or established in line with clear policies, is probably the single biggest factor limiting the quality of the law school. It leaves the law school with economic imperatives to take in enough students to fill all its available spaces, regardless of quality. As there are many more law schools in Ukraine than are required, and fees at the law faculty are higher than elsewhere, many students will opt to go where it is cheaper. This is particularly true given that under national legislation all law school diplomas are of equal status.

### **Recommendations:**

- Ensuring the quality of admitted students is a vital element in ensuring overall law school quality. While many of these problems are structural, stemming from the lack of autonomy the law faculty has in relation to the Ministry of Education, the law school must nonetheless improve its ability to attract the best students. This requires the law school to effectively communicate to prospective students precisely what benefits accrue to students and graduates of the school in comparison to other schools. This can be done by ensuring the law school offers a better legal education than competitor schools, offers more interesting opportunities, and a greater chance of finding a job.
- The law faculty should look for opportunities to promote some of the strong programs at the faculty that would give it a marketing advantage in attracting the best students. The international programs of the faculty, such as the Schools of Polish, German and American law would be one such area that could be used as an effective marketing tool.
- The law faculty should develop a comprehensive orientation program for new students to be implemented in the first few weeks of study to assist students making the transition to the study of law for the first time.
- The law faculty should better promote the strengths of the law faculty to prospective students in order to attract more qualified applicants.

**3.2** Institution students are assessed using published criteria, regulations and procedures that are applied consistently.

### **Key findings:**

- Law faculty assessment of students is generally considered fair. Teachers and students alike understood how assessment worked within the law school, what was required to achieve success in assessments, and how to prepare for them. Currently, each course can be assessed in three formats: seminar performance, modules (during the course), and an exam (end of course). Modules and exams consist of computer-based multiple choice tests, oral exams, or essays. Essays, however, are rarely used. In general, there is an approximately 50/50 split between modules and the final exam in determining a student's grade. Assessment through a mixture of participation, modules and a final exam is sound practice, ensuring students work consistently throughout the semester, and not over emphasizing final exam performance. Heads of department control the testing that takes place under each subject in their department.
- The issue at the law faculty is what the assessment regime is testing in the students. Overwhelmingly, in line with the institutional culture of the school (as mentioned under element 1) it is focused upon a student's knowledge of taught material. This makes the key determinant of success in exams, and therefore within the law faculty, the ability to memorize factual knowledge. It neglects to assess almost entirely the ability to apply this knowledge. It does not assess which students actually excel in *understanding* what they are learning. This understanding and application is an important part of developing critical thinking skills, vital for any type of legal work or scholarship. As one student said, "with tests, I have to say it is possible to not understand and still pass."
- In particular, the increasing movement towards computer testing is, while understandable, not conducive to good student assessment. Computer testing is tempting due to its transparency and fairness, its ease in administration, and its low time demands on staff in terms of marking. However, multiple-choice exams, unless extremely carefully crafted, only assess factual knowledge. Testing samples seen by the assessment team tested only recalled knowledge. Students and faculty also agreed this was the case. Likewise oral exams, while having their place, are not the optimal forum for objectively gauging understanding of learned materials. Essays and essay-based exams are a more effective ways of testing students' in depth understanding of materials. However, the law school's essay testing is generally not oriented in this direction, focusing instead upon the regurgitation of information available in learning materials.
- In terms of final exams, the law school operates a system whereby students receive a long list of possible exam questions one month before each exam. While identified learning outcomes are an important element ensuring students can focus their studies, the law school's approach leads to one dimensional research, group construction of answers, and means the student does not have to think creatively in how to apply the knowledge he or she has learned.
- Overall, the assessment regime at the law school, while largely fair, is formulaic and does not foster important problem solving and critical thinking skills. Rather, students excel by effectively learning by rote. This is not a cause, but rather a symptom of the deeper issue: the overall orientation of the law school in its teaching.

## **Recommendations:**

- Assessment is a vital part of law school life. It is how the faculty ensures its students are attaining the requisite level in their studies, differentiates levels of attainment, and is one important diagnostic tool in whether the teaching of the faculty is effective. A comprehensive review should be conducted of student assessments at all levels. Focus should be on designing testing that is valid (tests the knowledge or skills taught as part of the class); reliable (similar performances are graded similarly) and fair (no unfair surprise to students).
- Current computer testing should be supplemented with tests designed to assess students' ability to apply the knowledge learned and their critical thinking abilities. This should include a greater emphasis on problem scenario essay based testing, and should consider the use of open-book exams, which through removing the relevance of memory, can truly test understanding and application of knowledge.
- Important soft skills like group work can also be the subject of assessment, and should engage the students in constructive processes of self and group assessment.
- Teachers should be trained on testing methodologies, in particular how to construct effective problem based exam questions. Likewise, teaching will need to change to adequately prepare students for problem based testing. More time will need to be allowed to teachers to deal with the increased devising and marking burden of these methodologies.
- While the role of department heads should remain important, examinations need to be properly tested and assessed in relation to each other across the law faculty to ensure that exams are consistent in difficulty.

## **Element 4: Quality Assurance of Teaching Staff**

### Element 4: Notable Survey Findings

- Students were overwhelmingly in agreement that “law school teachers are well qualified and competent”, with 85% agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement. They also perceived their teacher organization and preparation positively, with 85% also agreeing or strongly agreeing that “law school teachers are well prepared and organized for class”.
- Responses were more mixed to questions about study guidance and support. For example, 49% of students were neutral or disagreed with the statement “I receive sufficient advice and support with my studies”. This contrasts with the 98% of teachers who agreed or strongly agreed that they “offer sufficient advice and support to students”.
- Only 29% of students agreed that they “have the opportunity to evaluate law school teachers’ performance”.



**4.1** Institution has process for selection and continuing assessment, including by students, to ensure teachers are qualified and competent.

**Key findings:**

- The law school has a consistent process for selecting teaching staff. Almost all teachers have gone, or are going through the same progression: first graduating, then achieving PhD, then becoming a teacher. This consistency has its benefits, but unfortunately also creates a one-dimensional teaching staff. Selection continually perpetuates very similar styles and approaches to teaching within the law faculty.
- A big problem in terms of quality of teacher candidates is the combination of law salary level and high work demands. Salary levels are determined by the Ministry of Education, and do not allow for significant progression. This means that the best law students are generally not attracted into teaching. As one senior faculty member put it: “We can’t talk about high quality recruitment of staff here”.
- Teachers are assessed only at the discretion of department heads. The goals, criteria and impact of this assessment are not clear. There is no consistent protocol for this assessment, and any criteria or levels which all teachers must satisfy in their pedagogy. This leads to large discrepancies in teacher quality both between and across departments, which was backed up by the comments of students.
- Student assessment of teachers does not currently exist in the Law faculty, but would be greatly advantageous for the faculty to embrace as part of general quality assurance standards. It would allow the diagnosis of problems in certain areas, and would create a culture of student learning as the driving force of the law school’s work. The results of these evaluations can be compiled to allow the administration to identify best practices from teachers. This is indicative of a general atmosphere in the law school where students are neither active participants in the life of the school, nor in their own learning. Generally, the relationship between the students and teachers is one of respect and commitment to learning. However, it is very formal, which affects the ability of students and teachers to communicate ideas effectively, to challenge pre-existing assumptions and to develop critical thinking.
- The current system also means that almost no teachers have actually practiced law at any level. This is hugely problematic if the law school is seeking to develop the skills needed by legal practitioners. This is a key factor in the law school’s current overwhelming orientation towards teaching theoretical knowledge, rather than practical skills and problem solving.

**Recommendations:**

- While this depends upon increased support from the Ministry of Education, the law faculty must seek to engage those with practitioner experience in the teaching of law, whether as adjunct or full time faculty. Interviews with judges, prosecutors and lawyers indicated strong interest in working with students at the faculty. This would enrich the teaching faculty significantly.
- Continuing teacher assessment must be integrated into the law school's quality assurance framework. This should include student assessment of courses and teaching as a fundamental element, systematic class observations, and a process whereby the information gathered can constructively feed into the law school's quality improvement process. This system could be established online, with overall results made public and shared with students, faculty members and supervisors.
- Teacher assessment criteria should be developed that reflects the full scope of teacher responsibilities including not only academic requirements but teaching quality, student relations, and non-scientific responsibilities.

**4.2** Institution shall have clearly established and published responsibilities of its teachers to ensure the quality of the academic program.

**Key findings:**

- Organization of teaching is generally a strength of the Law Faculty - all teachers interviewed were extremely clear on their role within the system and their areas of responsibility. Department heads are particularly vital players in this process, with a wide range of responsibilities in overseeing their departments. However, as elsewhere, the law school seems to lack specific published policies, which means that the responsibilities of the teachers depends almost entirely on the department heads, with the corresponding effect on consistency across and between departments.

**Recommendations:**

- The law faculty should establish and publish the responsibilities of individual teachers on the basis of clear criteria rather than subjective assessment to ensure quality and uniformity in responsibilities, while still relying on department heads to control the process.

## **Element 5: Curriculum, Teaching Methodologies, Learning Resources and Student Support**

### **Element 5: Key Survey Points**

- Student responses were generally positive about the teaching they received. For example, 86% agreed or strongly agreed that “law school teachers adequately explain key concepts.” This general positive perception on the part of students was reflected across a number of similar indicators.
- However, under this element the perceptions of graduates, well placed to gauge the usefulness of their studies in professional work, are particularly interesting. A significant proportions, 43%, strongly disagreed, disagreed or were neutral when asked whether their “legal education prepared them adequately for their current legal career”.

**5.1** Institution curriculum effectively prepares students for legal careers in government, private, or academic work.

### **Key findings:**

- The curriculum is extremely effective at instilling legal knowledge in students. All interview groups agreed this is a clear strength of the school. However, this does not in itself adequately prepare students for legal careers. Basic legal skills of writing, research, and rhetoric are not specifically catered for in the curriculum and are hence lacking in the student skill set. Legal employers generally agreed this was the case for most graduates. As one aptly put it: “Students know how the bicycle looks, how it should work, but not how to ride it.”
- This is linked to the highly problematic lack of flexibility in the core curriculum. Currently all law school courses are mandatory professional courses, with specialization only taking place at the graduate studies level. This is not in line with modern law school methodologies, as it does not allow students to develop specific interests and expertise in particular areas until too late in their education.
- Likewise there are not enough practical legal courses, particularly in the four-year bachelors degree. The focus is almost entirely theoretical at this level, as noted earlier in this report.
- Programs of internship, while important, are not optimal for developing student’s skills and interests. Early years internships can be short, using a work experience model where

the emphasis is upon understanding the role and work of the institutions. Later years internships must be longer, with specific criteria for attainment and skills development.

### **Recommendations:**

- The law school's curriculum should be reviewed with the following goals in mind:
  - A minimum of 30% and up to 50% of all courses of study should be electives.
  - Development of basic legal skills courses in the Bachelor studies and more extensive classes in Masters studies should be developed; the courses should include practical legal reasoning, research methods, legal writing and oral advocacy at the Bachelor level.
  - As the curriculum is reviewed and developed, every effort should be made to include a practical element in each course offered to supplement the theory already taught.
  - The faculty should accept that it is permissible and desirable to give academic credit for substantial and meaningful skills development classes such as the law laboratory (clinic) and the special schools of law.
- The law school should consider developing its internship program to include a wider range of receiving institutions, including local government, courts, prosecutors, law firms, and civil society groups. These institutions should be engaged in the design of the internship program, which should allow for the receipt of credit. Internship or practical credits should be a required aspect of the law school curriculum.
- In the same vein, the law school should seek to engage a group of practicing professionals to lead or contribute to practically-focused classes and clinical studies. This would complement the current teaching by faculty who are very strong on theory, but do not have such a degree of practical knowledge as a practitioner could provide.
- The law faculty should follow legal clinical best practices and get active members of the bar involved in mentoring and advising students whenever possible in the law faculty laboratory (clinic).

### **5.2 Institution employs modern teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning.**

#### **Key findings:**

- While some teachers use modern interactive methodologies in their teaching, teaching remains primarily lecture-based and non-interactive in nature. This methodology, while still dominant in many law schools across the world, is not the most conducive to effective and broad-based student learning, especially for younger students.
- Where interactive methodologies were used, teachers were far more engaged with members of the class, and students were in turn more attentive to teaching. However, even in interactive classes, the very formal ethos of the school, particularly in the

relationship between students and teachers, hinders truly interactive and creative learning on the part of the students.

- The teaching load is too high, which means the number of classes students must attend is also too high. The correlation of lectures, seminars and hours for independent study should be 1: 1: 1. This focus on long hours of classroom teaching does not encourage the skills of independent study, and most students agreed that passing the exams demanded only the memorizing of lecture notes.

### **Recommendations:**

- The faculty should undertake a comprehensive training for teachers on modern interactive teaching methods with an emphasis on those methods appropriate for legal studies including experiential learning, using case studies, role plays, and the Socratic dialogue among others. These should compliment the basic teaching methodology some teachers are getting from the University Pedagogy Department. All new teachers should have to undergo this training before teaching in the faculty.
- As resources allow the faculty should work to have modern presentation assets available to teachers in all classrooms. Future classroom design and remodeling should allow for more flexible educational settings beyond just the strict lecture format in at least some classrooms. A flexible educational setting would accommodate more interactive methods of teaching such as small group work by the students.
- Group work should be an integral and expected part of law school academic life. This kind of work is more replicative of the team-based work most students will be required to participate in after graduation. Group work will help students to develop the “soft” interpersonal skills that are currently not the focus of the curriculum. These skills would include the ability to collaborate, to contribute in a team setting, to problem solve, and to effectively communicate with others, among other such skills.
- The law faculty should actively encourage participation in skills based activities such as the legal clinic (laboratory), as well as local, regional and International moot court and mock trial competitions. Faculty and students who work in these areas should be given appropriate assistance and support as well as credit for the time spent on these activities.
- The law faculty should consider changing the class format that seems to be predominant in current classroom teaching. The current format is very formal, with students being called upon, standing and responding. There is limited ability for effective interaction or full use of critical thinking in this format.
- The law school should consider adjusting the ratio of class time to independent study, which currently seems unbalanced in favor of time in the classroom.

### **5.3 Institution ensures resources available for the support of student learning are adequate and appropriate.**

### **Key findings:**

- A particular strength of the school is that required learning materials are easily and freely available to students, via the library, and online. However, these resources are generally quite one-dimensional and theory based. Further, the heavily prescribed nature of core texts does not allow for individual investigation or study, or the development of high-level independent research skills on the part of the students.
- The law school library is an efficient distributor of all core texts. However, it would benefit from a greater range of volumes for students to use for the purposes of independent study, and additional computers. Likewise, the university library is extremely well run and progressive in outlook. The growing range of online services freely available to students is a key strength of the Library service, and of great benefit to students.

### **Recommendations:**

- As the curriculum is revised, textbooks should also be edited to include additional practical materials for use in class. They should include cases, case studies or fact patterns, discussion points, samples and exercises directed to the practical implementation of the legal theory in each chapter.
- Courses should ensure there is an extended list of more detailed reading beyond prescribed texts, so students may pursue independent study beyond what the current curriculum allows.

### **Element 6: Administration and Information Systems**

#### **Element 6: Key Survey Points**

- While 72% of students agreed or strongly agreed that “the law school is well organized and administers courses effectively”, there were slightly less positive perceptions of student the ability to access important data about their studies. 45% of students strongly disagreed, agreed, or were only neutral in response to the statement “I can access important information and data about my courses and progress”.
- Graduates of the past five years were markedly more critical than current students of the law school across all indicator questions under this element, while teachers were, as elsewhere, generally slightly more positive.

**6.1** Institution effectively manages and administers programs of study to ensure conducive learning environment for students.

**Key findings:**

- The law school has a solid administrative core, with clearly defined roles and expectations for teachers and students, and a very hard working ethos. This discipline is a clear strength of the faculty; however, it also contributes to a weakness. It is not an environment that seems particularly conducive to thinking creatively about teaching and learning, and is not oriented towards reform due to the long-term ingrained nature of all processes.
- Communication is not a strength of the law school's administration. Online communication is the most efficient way to convey information both between teachers and between the faculty and students. The current methods of notice-boards, in person announcements and relying upon student representatives is inefficient as compared to the distribution of group emails to pre-defined email lists. Concerns over students not checking their emails would soon abate if email were the default method to receive information.
- The relationship between teachers and students is very respectful and cordial, but would benefit from a less formal atmosphere and more opportunity for students to participate in the direction of the law school.

**Recommendations:**

- The use of student representatives in the faculty's government should be expanded where possible. Each chair should consider a student advisory group that can provide feedback and ideas for the students who are active in each chair.
- Administrators, Deans, Department Chairs and faculty members should explore opportunities for less formal interaction with the students to develop a better working relationship and trust with the students.
- The law school should, as part of a modernization process designed to utilize the potential of online systems, maintain a database of student emails for the purpose of communication. Ideally, these emails would be student accounts created upon enrollment.
- The existence of the website, which is regularly updated, is an achievement the law school should be proud of. This website should be further developed to become a one stop portal for all law school information, for current and prospective students, teachers, and administrators.

**6.2** Institution has an effective process to collect, analyze and use relevant information for the effective management of programs of study.

**Key findings:**

- Information collection and handling currently takes place in a systematic sub-optimal way. According to administrators, the Ministry of Education's reporting requirements play a role in this. The law school's computer based database is a very commendable effort to modernize the information handling practices of the school, and can be built upon as part of an ongoing modernization process.

**Recommendations:**

- As mentioned, the law school should seek to develop and implement an online system of information handling and access. This system should include profiles for all students including details, grades, schedules, and any other relevant information. It should be password accessible, with limitations where necessary, to both students and faculty. This system would greatly decrease the current work burden of paper based information management, decrease the need for students to take up administrator time seeking basic information on class scheduling and grades, and bring the law school in line with international best practices for information management.

**Element 7: Public Information**

**7.1** Institution regularly publishes up to date, impartial and objective information, both quantitative and qualitative, about the programs and awards they are offering.

**Key Findings:**

- The law faculty does not currently prioritize the publication of information about the school, its programs, and awards. If it is to attract the best students, it must change this approach.
- External relations, particularly with potential students, alumni and legal employers, should be developed, improving the level of recognition received by the faculty, and ensuring the school is able to assist students in finding employment upon completion of studies.
- The school's relationships with international partners should be fostered and further developed, with the focus on knowledge exchange and improving overall student experience.

**Recommendations:**

- The website should be utilized as a complete online resource for information about the law school, accessible to all, with an English language version. It must include all data on applications, courses, students, as well as important information on employability statistics of law graduates.



- Funds permitting, an office for external relations should be established, responsible for the development of internship programs with potential employers, law firms, and alumni relations.

## **VI. RECOMMENDATIONS TO NATIONAL GOVERNMENT**

Ukrainian higher education authorities have to reconsider the unique position of law faculties in the higher education system. Under the Soviet system State University law faculties have been largely seen as training academies for state law enforcement agencies including police, prosecution and the judiciary. In the modern context of a government based on democratic principles and the rule of law, law faculties are important to generating legal professionals for both the public and private sectors who have the knowledge and skills necessary to fulfill the role of a legal professional.

Part of this recognition of the unique position of law faculties requires acknowledgement that law faculties cannot be regulated as just another academic department of a University. Effective oversight of legal education requires developing and implementing a set of targeted standards that recognizes the professional development role of legal education and the unique dual role of knowledge transfer and skills development that is part of modern legal education.

With this in mind, the following recommendations are suggested:

- The system of quality assurance in higher education should be introduced under the new Law on Higher Education;
- National standards specific to legal education should be designed;
- Creation of Quality Assurance units in all accredited higher education institutions in the new Law on Higher Education as one of the mandatory structural units of a university;
- To ensure an adequate system for the accreditation of universities with clearly formulated accreditation standards; including accreditation standards specific for law faculties; law and regulations should allow for regular evaluation of faculty by students.
- Standards for law faculties should be based on best practices and principles for effective legal education meeting international standards;
- An independent body similar to those employed in other countries for accreditation should be created.
- While basic standards should be set for each law faculty, the individual faculties should be given broad flexibility in choosing methods to implement those standards and develop their own areas of excellence. The Ministry should allow law faculties to decrease the mandatory course load of students and foster the creation of an effective elective course of studies as a regular part of the curriculum.

Legislation and regulation should allow faculty to engage in professional training in local self-government bodies, courts and other legal organizations which would assist in training legal skills of students.

- The Ministry should review the distribution of state paid student positions at the law faculties in Ukraine in order to create a more balanced and fair allotment for faculties such as Ivan Franko.

## ANNEX A: LIST OF MEETINGS, INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS

### ON-SITE LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE

Day 1	May 19, 2014 – Monday			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact
09:00-10:00	<b>All experts</b>	Introductory meeting with Prof. Andrii Boiko, Dean of the Faculty, and his deputies, namely Associate Prof. Vitalii Kosovych, Associate Prof. Nataliya Radanovych, Associate Prof. Oleksandr Marin, Associate Prof. Roksolana Lemyk	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
10:00-11:00	<b>All experts</b>	Tour around the Faculty, in particular classrooms, departments, moot court room, computer lab, laboratories etc.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
11:00-12:00	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Interview with Deputy Deans	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
11:00-12:00	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 407	Deputy Dean Vitalii Kosovych +380679127859
12:00-13:00	<b>All experts</b>	DFG with Deputy Deans	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02

13:30-14:30	<b>Lunch</b>			
15:00-16:00	<b>All experts</b>	Meeting with the acting Rector and Vice-Rectors of the University	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Office of the acting Rector	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
16:00-17:00	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Interview with heads of departments of the Faculty Professor Nor V.T., Professor Kossak V.M., and Professor Pylypenko P.D.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
16:00-17:00	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 407	Deputy Dean Vitalii Kosovych +380679127859
17:00-18:00	<b>All experts</b>	DFG with heads of departments of the Faculty Professor Tyshchuk B.Y., Professor Luts L.A., Professor Kobyletskyi M.M., Professor Hural P.F., and Associate Professor Shkolyk A.M.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
<b>Day 2</b>	<b>May 20, 2014 – Tuesday</b>			
<b>Time</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Contact</b>
09:00-10:00	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Interview with judges (graduates and employers) Kablak P.I., Chief Judge of the Lviv Court of Appeals Nataliya Kurii, Judge of the Court of Appeals of Lviv Oblast Vitaliia Tertychnyi, Chief Judge of Lviv Circuit	Lviv Court of Appeals 7, Soborna Square, Lviv	Tel. +380 32 235-90-15

		Administrative Court		
09:00-10:00	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Deputy Dean Vitalii Kosovych +380679127859
10:00-11:00	<b>All experts</b>	DFG with judges (graduates and employers) Judges of the Court of Appeals of Lviv Oblast	Lviv Court of Appeals 7, Soborna Square, Lviv	Tel. +380 32 235-90-15
11:50-13:10	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Attending the classes of 4-year students Practical class on “Criminalistics”. Professor Kohutych I.I.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 511	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
11:50-13:10	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Attending the classes of 4-year students Lecture “Civil Procedural Law of Ukraine” Associate Professor Navrotska Y.V.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 214	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
13:30-14:30	<b>Lunch</b>			
15:00-16:00	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Getting familiarized with the operations of a legal clinic It is managed by Head of the clinic Yatsenko N.V. (has been working at the Faculty since 2012) Coordination is conducted by the teachers of departments of: labor, agricultural and environmental law; civil law and proceedings, administrative and financial law	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 211	Deputy Dean Vitalii Kosovych +380679127859
15:00-	Finlay Young	Getting familiarized with the operations of the library	Lviv, 14 Sichovych	Tel. +380 32 239 41

16:00	and Myroslava Antonovych	of the Faculty of Law and University More information about employees of the library will be provided additionally	Striltsiv St., 5, Drahomanova St.	02
16:00-18:00	<b>All experts</b>	Getting familiarized with documents of the Faculty	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St.	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
<b>Day 3</b>	<b>May 21, 2014 – Wednesday</b>			
<b>Time</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Contact</b>
09:00-10:00	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Interview with employees of the prosecutor's office (graduates and employers)	Prosecution of Lviv Oblast Lviv, 17, Shevchenka Avenue	Tel. +380 32 235-83-22
09:00-10:00	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Deputy Dean Vitalii Kosovych +380679127859
10:00-11:00	<b>All experts</b>	DFG with employees of the prosecutor's office (graduates and employers)	Prosecution of Lviv Oblast Lviv, 17, Shevchenka Avenue	Tel. +380 32 235-83-22
11:50-13:10	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Attending the classes of 1-year students Practical class on "Theory of Law and State" Associate Professor Nychka Y.V.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 210	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
11:50-13:10	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Attending the classes of 1-year students Lecture. "Constitutional Law of Ukraine". Associate Professor Zayats I.Y.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 214	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02

13:30-14:30	<b>Lunch</b>			
15:00-16:00	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Interview with teachers of the Faculty One representative from each of the eight departments	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St.  Ауд. 409.	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
15:00-16:00	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 407	Deputy Dean Vitalii Kosovych +380679127859
16:00-17:00	<b>All experts</b>	DFG with teachers of the Faculty Two teachers from each of the eight departments	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
17:00-18:00	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Interview with postgraduates of the Faculty	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 407	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
17:00-18:00	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Interview with students of Master's and Specialist's programs	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
<b>Day 4</b>	<b>May 22, 2014 – Thursday</b>			
<b>Time</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Contact</b>
09:00-10:00	Delanie Swenson and Oksana	Interview with advocates (graduates and employers), private lawyers	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St.	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02

	Syroid	Chair of the Lviv Oblast Bar Pavlyshyn B.Y. Employees of private companies “Sydorovych and Partners”, “Prokopyshyn and Partners” and other employees	Room 409	
09:00-10:00	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Meeting with students of schools of Polish, Austrian, German and American law	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room 214	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
10:00-11:00	<b>All experts</b>	DFG with advocates (graduates and employers) Private lawyers	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Ауд. 409.	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
11:50-13:10	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Attending the classes of 2-year students Practical class on “Civil Law of Ukraine” Associate Professor Tarasenko L.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 210	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
11:50-13:10	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Attending the classes of 2-year students Lecture on “Criminal Law of Ukraine” Associate Professor Panchak O.G.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 214	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
13:30-14:30	<b>Lunch</b>			
15:00-16:00	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Interview with students	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 407	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
15:00-16:00	Delanie Swenson and Oksana	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes,	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St.	Deputy Dean Vitalii Kosovych



	Syroid	conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report	Room: 409	+380679127859
16:00-17:00	<b>All experts</b>	DFG with students	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
17:00-18:00	<b>All experts</b>	Assessment of students' papers	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
<b>Day 5</b>	<b>May 23, 2014 – Friday</b>			
<b>Time</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Contact</b>
09:00-11:00	<b>All experts</b>	DFG with postgraduates and Masters of the Faculty	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
11:50-13:10	Finlay Young and Myroslava Antonovych	Attending the classes of 3-year students Lecture on “Civil Law of Ukraine” Associate Professor Bek Y.B.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 214	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
11:50-13:10	Delanie Swenson and Oksana Syroid	Attending the classes of 3-year students Practical class on “Criminal Law of Ukraine” Associate Professor Khyliuk S.V.	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 210	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
13:30-14:30	<b>Lunch</b>			
15:00-15:40	<b>All experts</b>	Evaluation of a testing center, process of testing assessment of knowledge and test items	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room: 415	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02

16:00-17:00	<b>All experts</b>	Final meeting with Prof. Andrii Boiko, Dean of the Faculty	Lviv, 14 Sichovych Striltsiv St. Room 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02
17:00-18:00	<b>All experts</b>	Wrap-up and agreeing on the process of integrating the developed parts of report, further development of report and coordination of this work	Room 409	Tel. +380 32 239 41 02

## ANNEX B: FULL SURVEY RESULTS

### THE USAID FAIR JUSTICE PROJECT LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 1 – CURRENT STUDENTS – **155 Participants**

SECTION 1: STATEMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	AVG / 5
1.1 The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education	0	2	6	57	36	4.3
1.2 The law school has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education	0	6	13	48	33	4.1
1.3 There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education	1	18	19	46	17	3.6
2.1 The Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students	1	5	22	58	14	3.8
3.1 The Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic	3	13	11	34	38	3.9
3.2 Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair	4	21	18	38	19	3.5
3.3 I have received detailed feedback on my work	3	19	17	50	11	3.5
3.4 I have received this feedback promptly	2	18	28	43	9	3.5
3.5 This feedback has helped me to clarify things I did not understand.	4	15	26	41	14	3.5
4.1 Law school teachers are well qualified and competent	0	2	13	44	41	4.7
4.2 Law school teachers are well organized and prepared for classes	0	3	12	48	37	4.2
4.3 I have the opportunity to	13	31	27	22	6	2.7

evaluate my law school teachers performances						
4.4 I receive sufficient advice and support with my studies	5	21	23	36	15	3.4
4.5 I am been able to contact law school teachers when I need to	4	24	17	34	21	3.6
4.6 Good advice is available when I need to make study choices	2	14	31	38	16	3.6
5.1 I believe my legal education will prepare me adequately for a future legal career	1	6	15	39	39	4.1
5.2 Law school teachers use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning	3	10	22	44	20	3.7
5.3 Law School teachers adequately explain key concepts	2	3	10	54	32	4.1
5.4 Law School teachers are enthusiastic about the subject they are teaching	0	7	25	42	26	3.8
5.5 My law school education is interesting and intellectually stimulating	1	9	17	43	30	3.9
5.6 Adequate learning resources are available for me to learn course materials	3	9	13	51	24	3.8
5.7 I have access to the internet for research purposes	0	2	5	40	52	4.4
6.1 The law school is well organized and administers courses effectively	0	7	21	52	20	3.9
6.2 The timetabling of my classes works efficiently	1	19	23	46	12	3.5
6.3 Any changes in my courses or teaching are communicated effectively	6	13	18	46	17	3.6
6.4 I can access important information and data about the my courses and progress	8	17	20	36	19	3.4

# THE USAID FAIR JUSTICE PROJECT LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 2 – LAW SCHOOL GRADUATES (LAST FIVE YEARS) – **178 participants**

<b>SECTION 1: STATEMENT</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>AVG /5</b>
1.1 The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education	3	14	19	50	13	3.5
1.2 The law school had policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education	4	24	17	45	11	3.4
1.3 There were opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education	9	21	25	36	8	3.1
2.1 The Law School monitored the quality of my legal education	4	31	31	26	8	2.4
3.1 The Law School admission process was transparent, fair, and meritocratic	17	18	23	25	16	3
3.2 Law School assessment arrangements and marking were fair	16	22	24	31	8	3
3.3 I received detailed feedback on my work	9	28	24	33	6	3
3.4 I received this feedback promptly	10	28	34	24	3	2.8
3.5 This feedback helped me to clarify things I did not understand.	6	32	32	25	5	2.6
4.1 My law school teachers were well qualified and competent	3	13	23	48	13	3.6
4.2 My law school teachers were well organized and prepared for classes	4	14	31	38	13	3.4
4.3 I had the opportunity to evaluate my law school teachers performances	28	45	10	14	3	2.2

4.4 I received sufficient advice and support with my studies	11	25	34	24	6	2.9
4.5 I was able to contact law school teachers when I needed to	12	38	27	19	4	2.7
4.6 Good advice was available when I needed to make study choices	10	34	35	17	3	2.7
5.1 I believe my legal education prepared me adequately for my current legal career	10	17	16	37	21	3.5
5.2 Law school teachers used a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning	7	15	21	42	15	3.4
5.3 Law School teachers adequately explained key concepts	8	15	26	40	11	3.3
5.4 Law School teachers were enthusiastic about the subject they were teaching	3	16	42	29	9	2.8
5.5 My law school education was interesting and intellectually stimulating	8	17	24	37	14	3.3
5.6 Adequate learning resources were available for me to learn course materials	6	22	15	47	10	3.3
5.7 I had access to the internet for research purposes	6	11	8	51	24	3.8
6.1 The law school was well organized and administered my courses effectively	9	22	39	21	8	2.9
6.2 The timetabling of my classes worked efficiently	10	16	29	39	6	3.2
6.3 Any changes in my courses or teaching were communicated effectively	14	16	25	36	9	3.1
6.4 I could access important information and data about the my courses and progress	13	21	23	33	9	2.7

# THE USAID FAIR JUSTICE PROJECT LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Survey 3 - Teachers - **66 participants**

<b>SECTION 1: STATEMENT</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>AVG / 5</b>
1.1 The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education	0	0	0	44	56	4.6
1.2 The law school has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education	0	2	8	49	41	4.3
1.3 There are opportunities for faculty to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education	0	2	7	49	42	4.3
2.1 The Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students	0	6	15	45	34	4.1
3.1 The Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic	0	5	7	43	46	4.3
3.2 Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair	0	10	10	52	28	4.0
3.3 I provide detailed feedback on student work	0	0	12	44	44	4.2
3.4 I provide this feedback promptly	0	0	10	51	39	4.3
3.5 This feedback is designed to help students clarify things they did not understand.	0	0	10	37	53	4.4
4.1 Law school teachers are well qualified and competent	0	3	9	58	30	4.2
4.2 Law school teachers are well organized and prepared for classes	0	3	20	50	27	4.0
4.3 I have the formal opportunity to evaluate my own performance as a law	0	13	7	48	32	4.0

teacher						
-4.4 I offer sufficient advice and support to students	0	0	2	54	44	4.4
4.5 I am available for students to contact me when they need to	0	2	0	27	71	4.7
4.6 Students receive good advice when they need to make study choices	0	0	3	39	58	4.6
5.1 I believe the law school prepares students adequately for a future legal career	0	3	10	50	37	4.2
5.2 I use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning	0	0	8	63	29	4.2
5.3 I adequately explain key concepts to students	0	0	0	55	45	4.5
5.4 I am enthusiastic about the subject I am teaching	0	0	0	26	74	4.7
5.5 I ensure my classes are interesting and intellectually stimulating	0	0	0	26	74	4.7
5.6 Adequate learning resources are available for students to learn course content	0	3	8	47	42	4.3
5.7 I have access to the internet for research purposes	0	2	3	21	74	4.7
6.1 The law school is well organized and administers courses effectively	0	5	9	51	35	4.2
6.2 The timetabling of my classes works efficiently	0	10	11	49	30	4.0
6.3 Any changes in my courses or teaching are communicated effectively	2	8	8	37	45	4.2
6.4 I can access important information and data about the courses and students I teach	0	6	8	55	31	4.1



# THE USAID FAIR JUSTICE PROJECT LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

## SURVEY 4 – LAW SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS - 5 Participants

<b>SECTION 1: STATEMENT</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>AVG/5</b>
1.1 The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education	0	0	0	20	80	4.8
1.2 The law school has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education	0	0	0	40	60	4.6
1.3 There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education	0	0	0	60	40	4.4
2.1 The Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students	0	0	0	60	40	4.4
3.1 The Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic	0	0	0	60	40	4.4
3.2 Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair	0	0	0	60	40	4.4
4.1 Law school teachers are well qualified and competent	0	0	0	60	40	4.4
4.2 Law school teachers are well organized and prepared for classes	0	0	0	60	40	4.4
4.3 I am able to contact law school teachers when I need to for administrative purposes	0	20	0	40	40	4.0
5.1 I believe our legal education will prepare students adequately for a	0	0	0	20	80	4.8

future legal career						
5.2 Law school teachers use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning	0	0	0	80	20	4.2
5.3 Law School teachers adequately explain key concepts	0	0	0	100	0	4.0
5.4 Law School teachers are enthusiastic about the subject they are teaching	0	0	40	60	0	3.6
5.5 Adequate learning resources are available for students to learn course materials	0	0	0	100	0	4.0
6.1 The law school is well organized and administers courses effectively	0	0	0	40	60	4.6
6.2 The timetabling of classes works efficiently	0	0	0	80	20	4.2
6.3 Any changes in courses or teaching are communicated effectively to students and faculty	0	20	0	40	40	4.0
6.4 Important information and data about courses and student progress is available to faculty and students	0	0	0	100	0	4.0
6.5 As an administrator I have adequate resources to effectively and efficiently carry out my responsibilities	0	0	0	80	20	4.2

## ANNEX C: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

The USAID Fair Justice Project  
Legal Education Quality Assessment

### **CLASSROOM TEACHING OBSERVATION PROTOCOL**

Faculty Observed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Observation: \_\_\_\_\_  
Course Observed: \_\_\_\_\_

Rating scale: 1= very poor, 2= weak, 3= average, 4= good, 5= excellent, NA = Not applicable

<b><i>CONTENT</i></b>					
Main ideas are clear and specific	1	2	3	4	5
Sufficient variety in supporting information	1	2	3	4	5
Relevancy of main ideas was clear	1	2	3	4	5
Higher order thinking was required	1	2	3	4	5
Instructor related ideas to prior knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
Definitions were given for vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5
<b><i>ORGANIZATION</i></b>					
Introduction captured attention	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction stated organization of lecture	1	2	3	4	5
Effective transitions (clear w/summaries)	1	2	3	4	5
Clear organizational plan	1	2	3	4	5
Concluded by summarizing main ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Reviewed by connecting to previous classes	1	2	3	4	5
Previewed by connecting to future classes	1	2	3	4	5
<b><i>INTERACTION</i></b>					
Instructor questions at different levels	1	2	3	4	5
Sufficient wait time	1	2	3	4	5
Students asked questions	1	2	3	4	5
Instructor feedback was informative	1	2	3	4	5
Instructor incorporated student responses	1	2	3	4	5
Good rapport with students	1	2	3	4	5

<b>VERBAL/NON-VERBAL</b>						
Language was understandable	1	2	3	4	5	
Articulation and pronunciation clear	1	2	3	4	5	
Absence of verbalized pauses (er, ah, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	
Instructor spoke extemporaneously	1	2	3	4	5	
Accent was not distracting	1	2	3	4	5	
Effective voice quality	1	2	3	4	5	
Volume sufficient to be heard	1	2	3	4	5	
Rate of delivery was appropriate	1	2	3	4	5	
Effective body movement and gestures	1	2	3	4	5	
Eye contact with students	1	2	3	4	5	
Confident & enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	
<b>USE OF MEDIA</b>						
Presentation content Clear & well organized	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Visual aids can be easily read	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Instructor provided an outline/handouts	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Computerized instruction effective	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<b>OTHER NOTES:</b>						
Strengths:						
Weaknesses:						
Overall Effectiveness Rating:	1	2	3	4	5	

## ANNEX D: ASSESSMENT TEAM BIOGRAPHIES

Professor Delaine Swenson is an American lawyer and law professor with over 25 years of experience in training and the law. He presently serves as the Department Head of the Chair of International and American Law at the Faculty of Law of John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland and serves as the Director and was the founder of the Center for Advancing Legal Skills. He is also a Founder and is currently Chair of the Founders Council of the Rule of Law Institute Foundation. Professor Swenson has conducted training for lawyers, judges, prosecutors, law professors and students and government officials in over 30 countries for clients such as the US Department of State, the US Department of Justice, the American Bar Association, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United Nations, and the European Union as well as several large law firms, including Wardynski & Partners in Poland and White & Case in Asia. Professor Swenson also has over 10 years of experience as a trial lawyer in the state and federal courts of the United States, and was the Young Lawyer of the Year in the State of Washington in 1993.

Finlay Young is a Scottish independent lawyer and researcher whose work in transitional countries focuses on supporting legal education and judicial reform, access to justice, and addressing issues of prolonged pre-trial detention. He has designed and led research projects for organizations such as the World Bank, Open Society Foundation, and the American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative. He has managed US government funded legal reform projects in a number of different national contexts. He has previously taught at the University of Glasgow in Scotland, and done academic work at the Institute of Law in Zurich, Switzerland. He holds law degrees from the University of Glasgow and the University of Pennsylvania Law School, and passed the New York Bar exam in 2009.

Dr. Myroslava Antonovych is the Head of International Law Department and Associate Professor of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. She also serves as the Director and was the founder of the Center for International Human Rights at Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. Dr. Antonovych has been teaching Public International Law and International Human Rights for more than 20 years. She has been a visiting professor at the law schools of the USA and Europe. She holds law degrees from Lviv Ivan Franko National University, McGill University, Canada (LL.M) and Ukrainian Free University, Germany (PhD in Law). She participated in quality assurance projects through OSCE and AFP HESP.

Oksana Syroyid is the Executive Director of the “Ukrainian Legal Foundation” in Kyiv, Ukraine. She also served as National Project Manager, Head of Rule of Law Unit (Administrative Law, Administrative Justice and Legal Education Issues), Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine. Ms. Syroyid holds a Masters of Law (LL.M) from the University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada, M.A. in Law Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University, Center for Legal Studies in Kyiv, Ukraine and a B.A. in Political Science from the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in Kyiv, Ukraine.